

Serial No. 10/590,511  
Amendment of Feb. 5, 2010  
Reply to OA Oct. 5, 2009

### REMARKS

By this Amendment claims 2 and 5 have been amended to improve their presentations and to overcome the examiner's objections under 35 USC 112. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action the examiner has (1) rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishima et al. in view of Schindel and Dubiel, (2) rejected claims 2-4 and 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over these same three patents as combined, further in view of Alfano, (3) rejected claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over these same four patents as combined, further in view of Akkerman, (4) rejected claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishima et al. in view of Schindel, Dubiel and Ochtman, and (5) rejected claim 9 (and apparently claim 10) under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morishima et al. in view of Schindel, Dubiel and Abraham.

The applicant asserts that these rejections are incorrect!

Morishima et al. disclose a linear actuator with an anti-reverse rotation mechanism. The mechanism includes a torque limiter 8 associated with driven gear 9; however, the torque limiter is not directly connected to a planetary gear and sun wheel configured as an extended end of output shaft 11A.

Serial No. 10/590,511  
Amendment of Feb. 5, 2010  
Reply to OA Oct. 5, 2009

Schindel discloses a thrust actuator which includes a motor 74 having a drive shaft 130 connected to a drive gear 124, which in turn is connected to planetary pinion gears 120. It is unclear (and not explained) how the elements 124, 120 could be incorporated in the actuator of Morishima et al.

Dubiel discloses a rotary tool wherein an input shaft 26, which is driven by an output shaft of motor 15, drives a sun wheel 45 and planet wheels 46. A pressure cylinder with pressure rings 37 and 40 can act on balls 36 as a clutch. However, it is quite unclear how such a pressure clutch means could be implemented in the mechanism of Morishima et al.

The applicant asserts that in fact there is no basis for combining Morishima et al., Schindel and Dubiel as proposed by the examiner. And nothing the other secondary would overcome this essential deficiency in the examiner's rejection of the claims.


It is believe that the examiner's rejections are incorrect and should be withdrawn.

The government extension of time required for this filing should be charged to Deposit Account No. 04-2223.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:

  
Richard H. Tushin, Reg. No. 27,297  
Franklin Square, Third Floor West  
1300 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3353  
(202) 906-8680